

## **The Candidacies of U.S. Women of Color for Statewide Executive Office**

Kira Sanbonmatsu  
Rutgers University  
sanbon@rci.rutgers.edu

### **Abstract**

Scholarship on women of color in electoral politics is expanding. However, the relationship between political parties and the candidacies of women of color has largely been overlooked. Drawing on insights from gender, race, and intersectionality research, I examine the status of women of color and analyze the role of parties in shaping their candidacies. I examine contests for statewide elective executive office from 2000 to 2012 with Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) data. While women of color have made important inroads with respect to statewide officeholding, they remain underrepresented as candidates and officeholders in both parties.

Paper prepared for delivery at the 2013 American Political Science Association annual meetings, Chicago, IL. I am grateful to Gilda Morales and Christabel Cruz for assistance. I thank Jessica Preece, Michael Miller, and Denise Baer for comments on an earlier version of this paper, and I thank NALEO and the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies for data on Latino and African American officeholding.

## **The Candidacies of U.S. Women of Color for Statewide Executive Office**

The presence of women of color public officials conveys the symbolic message that women of color are suitable to rule (Mansbridge 1999; Harris-Perry 2011). Even as candidates, women of color disrupt societal expectations that minority politicians are male and female politicians are white (Junn 2009). The election of women of color contributes to the overall status of minority officeholders and female officeholders, and their rise can help to break down both racial and gender barriers in electoral politics (Hardy-Fanta et al. 2006). Women of color can serve as role models and mentors, helping other minority women run for office (Sanbonmatsu forthcoming). And they can improve the substantive representation of underrepresented groups, thereby enhancing the legitimacy of American democracy.<sup>1</sup>

The challenges minority women face in achieving elective office are many, and minority women are underrepresented in politics around the globe (Hughes forthcoming). Women of color usually fare the worst when their presence in office is compared with their share of the population, and most U.S. elected officials of color are men while most women officials are white (Hardy-Fanta et al. 2006; CAWP 2013b). Minority women are disadvantaged by their location at the intersections of race, gender, and class inequalities, with implications for their pursuit of elective office (Prestage 1977; Carroll and Strimling 1983; Gill 1997; Collins 2000; Philpot and Walton 2007; Junn and Brown 2008; Gamble 2010). They have also occupied a unique position within the civil rights and feminist movements (Giddings 1984; White 1999; Collins 2000; Alexander-Floyd 2007; Beltran 2010; Ghavami and Peplau 2013).

---

<sup>1</sup> Studies show that women of color officials have a distinctive policy impact (Barrett 2001; Garcia Bedolla, Tate, and Wong 2005; Orey et al. 2006; Bratton, Haynie, and Reingold 2006; Fraga et al. 2008; Garcia et al. 2008; Reingold and Smith 2012).

Little scholarly attention has been paid to the role of political parties in the election of women of color. Because the vast majority of women of color elected officials are Democrats, the relationship might seem obvious. Only a small fraction of elected officials of color are Republicans, consistent with the two parties' realignment on civil rights (Carmines and Stimson 1989; Gurin, Hatchett, and Jackson 1989; Tate 1994).<sup>2</sup> The parties' distinct orientations toward racial politics continue, most recently with Republican party support of voter identification laws and the party's internal divisions on immigration policy. Yet, the first two women of color to win gubernatorial office—Governors Nikki Haley and Susana Martinez, both of whom were elected in 2010—are Republicans. Therefore, the status of minority women within both political parties merits investigation, and conducting that analysis is the primary goal of this paper.

A study focused on women of color specifically is warranted because their situation may not be captured by studies that rely on the lens of gender or race/ethnicity alone (Crenshaw 1989; Cohen 2003; Hancock 2007; Garcia Bedolla 2007; Junn and Brown 2008). The experiences and pathways to office of women of color often differ from those of both male candidates of color and white female candidates (McClain et al. 2005; Scola 2006; Philpot and Walton 2007; Fraga et al. 2006/2007; Lien et al. 2008; Sanbonmatsu, Carroll, and Walsh 2009; Palmer and Simon 2012; Lien and Swain 2013; Bejarano forthcoming). For example, minority women make up a higher proportion of legislators of color than do white women among white legislators (Tate 2003; Garcia Bedolla, Tate and Wong 2005; Hardy-Fanta et al. 2006). And there is some evidence that minority women are more ambitious than majority women (Darcy and Hadley 1988). The determinants of state legislative officeholding for women of color differ from that of white women or minority men (Scola 2006).

---

<sup>2</sup> See the Gender and Multicultural Leadership Project <http://www.gmcl.org/maps/national/gender.htm>, accessed March 18, 2013.

A secondary goal of this paper is to assess the status of women of color as candidates, which is especially important given the growing racial diversity of the U.S. population.<sup>3</sup> It may seem over determined that women of color appear to have less access to elective office compared with other groups. However, we will see that the story is complex, with more success stories than one might expect. With the substantial growth in the Latino and Asian American populations and the rise in minority women state legislators, it is likely that more women of color will run statewide in the future. State legislative officeholding by minority women is at a record high today, and women of color have driven a substantial proportion of the gains in Democratic women's state legislative officeholding (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu 2013).<sup>4</sup> Among African American elected officials, the rate of growth among women has outpaced that of men (Smooth 2010: 168); and in some states, growth in Latina state legislative officeholding has surpassed that for Latinos and women overall (Fraga et al. 2006/2007: 131).

### **Gender, Race, and Party Politics**

I draw on insights from gender, race, and intersectionality research to develop hypotheses about the role of parties in shaping minority women's candidacies. The role of parties in the recruitment and nomination of candidates has attracted renewed scholarly interest in recent years (e.g., Sanbonmatsu 2006b; Cohen et al. 2008; Crowder-Meyer 2010; Fox and Lawless 2010).

Some gender scholars have argued that more party control over the recruitment and nomination of candidates benefits women (Burrell 1993; Burrell 1994; Caul and Tate 2002; Crowder-Meyer 2010). However, Niven (1998) finds that party leaders seek out candidates who resemble themselves, and Sanbonmatsu (2006b) finds that party organizational strength

---

<sup>3</sup> According to the 2010 Census, minority females represent 18.4% of the total population (Census Fact Finder accessed July 24, 2012). CAWP data show that women of color are only 5.0% of state legislators (CAWP 2013b).

<sup>4</sup> In 2013, 367 women of color hold state legislative office (CAWP 2013b).

negatively affects women's state legislative representation. The gendered nature of party leaders' networks and party leader uncertainty about women's electability reduces the likelihood that women will be recruited (Sanbonmatsu 2006b). Although a disproportionate percentage of all women state legislators are Democrats—suggesting a Democratic edge with respect to the recruitment of women candidates (e.g., Elder 2012)—neither party appears to be sufficiently active in recruiting women (Sanbonmatsu 2006b; Carroll and Sanbonmatsu 2013).

Compared with their Anglo Democratic female counterparts, women of color state legislators are less likely to run as a result of party recruitment, consistent with the pattern that women of color are more likely to represent Democratic majority-minority districts (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu 2013). While this implies that women of color can successfully reach the legislature without the benefit of party recruitment, it is also the case that the Democratic party could be doing more to recruit women of color to run in a wider range of districts (Carroll and Sanbonmatsu 2013).

Turning to race scholarship, racial minorities, like women as a group, tend to be aligned with the Democratic party. But arguably, both major parties usually neglect African Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans (Frymer 1999; Wong 2006; Kim 2007; Harris 2012).<sup>5</sup> Democratic party leaders may not coalesce around a candidate of color out of fear of alienating white voters (Sonenshein 1990; Gamble 2010). Although whites can and do cast their ballots for minority candidates, it remains challenging for minority candidates to attract white voters, and racial fears and racially polarized voting persist (Sonenshein 1990; Hajnal 2007; Highton 2004; Segura and

---

<sup>5</sup> In the electorate, all three groups—particularly African Americans—are more likely to identify with the Democratic party (Tate 1994; de la Garza 2004; Wong et al. 2011). However, Hajnal and Lee (2011) find that one-third of Asian Americans and Latinos are best understood as nonidentifiers who do not identify as Independents or partisans on the traditional survey question about party identification.

Fraga 2008; Frederick and Jeffries 2009; Jeffries and Wavro 2011).<sup>6</sup> Statewide candidates of color typically need to balance a moderate campaign appeal to whites at the same time they attract minority voters, although the opponent's strategies and the nature of media coverage play parts as well (Sonenshein 1990; Mendelberg 2001; Caliendo and McIlwain 2006). While Barack Obama's election led to arguments that the country is "post-racial," studies show that he won despite racial voting (Hutchings 2009; Pasek et al. 2009; Piston 2010; Schaffner 2011). Moreover, Obama's election in 2008 spawned Tea Party mobilization, partly driven by race and immigration issues, helping the Republican party to victories in the 2010 elections; his election even led to the racialization of attitudes on other policies including health care (Tesler and Sears 2010; Skocpol and Williamson 2012; Tesler 2012). Growth in minority officeholding notwithstanding, the vast majority of elected officials of color are still elected from majority-minority districts (Grofman 1998; Lublin 1997; Wong 2006; Trounstein and Valdini 2008; Tesler and Sears 2010; Casellas 2011; Wong et al. 2011).

Some Republicans have argued the merits of a more diverse party image, and racial and gender diversity have been showcased at recent Republican National Conventions (Fauntroy 2007; Philpot 2007). While implicit racially conservative appeals are attractive, racially inclusive appeals have certain electoral advantages (Mendelberg 2001; Hutchings et al. 2004).

Republicans nominated several African American men for statewide races in 2006, including Michael Steele who lost his bid for the U.S. Senate but became Republican National Committee Chairman (Fauntroy 2007). Republican statewide candidates and officials of color, such as Governor Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, represent a departure from the party's traditional Southern strategy and can alter traditional racial voting patterns (Bejarano and Segura 2007).

---

<sup>6</sup> See Johnson et al. (2012) on African American access to the U.S. Senate and see Tate (1997) for an analysis of Carol Moseley Braun's election to the Senate. On the potential costs to substantive representation of race-neutral campaign strategies, see Harris (2012).

To the extent that women of color are securing Republican party support, it is possible that they are doing so as sacrificial lambs. Stambough and O'Regan (2007) found that women's access to the gubernatorial nomination differed by party, with Republican women more likely than Democratic women to be sacrificial lamb candidates. The authors did not address race/ethnicity in their account; nor do they pinpoint the causal mechanism for this finding. But their study may mean that the Republican party has an incentive to nominate a nontraditional candidate when the Democratic party is favored; this may result from the general election advantage that a generic Republican female candidate is thought to have among Democratic and Independent voters (Matland and King 2002). Such a nomination could also help the party's image in a symbolic sense, assuring moderate white voters that the party is compassionate (Hutchings et al. 2004). However, should the Republican party nominate people of color solely for hopeless contests, that strategy could jeopardize the party's attempts to display a diverse party image (Fauntroy 2007).

It is worth noting that whether these minority outreach efforts are sincere is the subject of debate. For example, Fraga and Leal (2004) argue that the Republican party has largely pursued a symbolic approach—appearing to be welcoming to Latinos—as a way to attract Latinos and moderate Whites. While there is some evidence that the party is actively recruiting Latino state legislative candidates (Casellas 2011), the presence of Latino statewide officials such as Governor Martinez is not necessarily due to party recruitment (Dade 2011).

### **Data and Hypotheses**

For my analysis of parties and women candidates of color, I focus on statewide elective executive office. While most research on statewide office is focused on governors, the remaining

offices are significant in their own right and can also be credentials for seeking gubernatorial and federal office (Beyle 2011).<sup>7</sup> By analyzing access to statewide executive office rather than legislative office, I seek to broaden the study of minority women's representation.<sup>8</sup> Studies of women candidates of color usually examine legislative office (e.g., Philpot and Walton 2007; but see McClain et al. 2005; Lien and Swain 2013), and most women of color officials represent majority-minority districts (Hardy-Fanta et al. 2006; Palmer and Simon 2012). This scholarly focus is understandable given that most minority women officeholders hold local and legislative positions. However, moving to a consideration of statewide office provides a better opportunity to analyze the relationship of political parties to the candidacies of women of color. Statewide contests are more likely to be competitive between the two parties than contests for what are typically Democratic majority-minority districts.<sup>9</sup> Contests for statewide office are also more likely to create incentives for the party to coalesce around the nomination of a favored candidate than contests for safe Democratic districts in which the Democratic primary is the main contest. Moreover, scholarly neglect of statewide executive offices can send the message that it is natural for women of color to lack access to those offices, and/or that such offices aren't realistically obtainable for women of color.

---

<sup>7</sup> Stambough and O'Regan (2007) found that most female gubernatorial candidates previously held statewide office.

<sup>8</sup> Whether party organizations "control" nominations is the subject of a renewed debate, given that U.S. elections are conventionally understood to be candidate-centered (Cohen et al. 2008). This debate about party influence in candidate selection has largely focused on the presidential level with insufficient attention paid to the role of party nominations in contemporary state elections, as Ray La Raja (2010) has observed.

<sup>9</sup> In light of the recent Supreme Court decision, *Shelby County v. Holder* (2013), that invalidated a key provision of the landmark Voting Rights Act, the future of minority officeholding and existence of majority-minority districts in covered areas that had previously been subject to federal preclearance requirements is unclear. This decision increases the importance of understanding whether minority women are able to compete in a wider range of contests, including those that feature a majority white population.



In this paper, I treat “women of color” as a category following Lien et al. (2008).<sup>10</sup> Doing so may make racial categories appear to be fixed and natural rather than socially and politically contested categories (Omi and Winant 1994; Hochschild et al. 2012). Categorizing any group as a group—whether it be women of color, people of color, or women—can obscure variation within the group (e.g., Beltran 2010). Differences among women of color by citizenship status, sexuality, educational attainment, income, occupation, and language can create inequalities among women in the likelihood of political participation—including the likelihood of running for office—within and across racial/ethnic categories. The process of racialization is itself dynamic and unstable (Omi and Winant 1994; Kim 1999), and the layer of gender creates unique experiences as well as stereotypes (e.g., Giddings 1984; King 1988; Collins 2000).

At the same time, grouping together “women of color” can be analytically useful given the structural situation of disadvantage created by race and gender inequalities (Lien et al. 2008). The common experience of being underrepresented as statewide executive officeholders is itself reason to conduct an analysis of women of color as a group. Due to the low number of women of color who have ever achieved statewide office, combining women across racial/ethnic backgrounds is also a way to make an analysis feasible.

In the gender and politics literature, some evidence indicates that women candidates for statewide executive positions face initial skepticism from voters about their credentials, and that voters may be more comfortable with women holding legislative rather than executive positions

---

<sup>10</sup> I use the terms “white women,” and “Anglo women” interchangeably to refer to nonhispanic white women and use “minority women” or “women of color” to indicate women who are African American, Latina, Asian American or Pacific Islander, or Native American. I use these categories with the recognition that they are fluid categories and that considerable diversity exists within categories, including ethnic differences. Given the persistence of racial inequalities, I employ these categories “provisionally” as recommended by Junn and Brown (2008).

(Dittmar 2012).<sup>11</sup> Dittmar (2012) found that nearly half of Democratic political consultants (43%) in a national survey believe it is easier for women to win voter support for a seat in the U.S. Senate than for gubernatorial office, though only about 16% of Republican political consultants did so (Dittmar 2012).<sup>12</sup> With respect to statewide offices, Fox and Oxley (2003) find that women are more likely to seek and hold “feminine” offices such as state education official than “masculine” offices such as attorney general. In the United States and cross-nationally, executive positions are typically held by men (Duerst-Lahti 2006; Jalalzai 2008).

Little is known about the status of women of color with respect to statewide office. Because race politics studies of stereotypes, campaigns, and statewide elections have largely been based on male candidates, it is not known if those findings apply to women of color (e.g., Sonenshein 1990; Segura and Fraga 2008; Sigelman et al. 1995; Reeves 1997; Mendelberg 2001). Meanwhile, the limited number of women and politics studies about statewide executive office have not addressed women of color specifically (e.g., Oxley and Fox 2004; Windett 2011).

The relationship between parties and women candidates for statewide office has attracted little scholarly attention. Anecdotal evidence suggests that women are overlooked by party leaders as candidates for statewide executive office—even in states such as Colorado and Maine which have often led the nation for women’s state legislative representation (Sanbonmatsu 2006b). The difficulties that women have faced in reaching high office, including the office of the governor, may stem from the challenges of building both party and donor support (Barbara Lee Family Foundation 2001; Baer 2003). However, in a multivariate analysis of statewide

---

<sup>11</sup> Campaigns for executive office may be more complicated for women given that women are more often seen as the supportive spouse of a candidate for president or governor than as the autonomous candidate or executive (Dittmar 2013).

<sup>12</sup> Dittmar (2012: 70) found that most Republican consultants (72%) believe a woman’s chances are about the same whether she pursues a Senate seat versus the office of governor, whereas only 34% of Democratic consultants did so. Smaller proportions identified the Senate as the more difficult office for women (3% of Republicans and 14% of Democrats).

elections over time, Oxley and Fox (2004) did not find an effect for party control of nominations on women's presence as candidates.

Data from the Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) show that women of color fare much worse at the level of statewide elective executive office compared with other levels of office. Women of color are 14.7% of all statewide executive women in 2013, up from 6.5% in the year 2000 (CAWP 2000; CAWP 2013b). Yet, in 2013 minority women are a larger share of all female members of Congress (29.9%) and female state legislators (20.6%) than they are of female statewide executives (14.7%) (CAWP 2013b). Women of color are just 3.4% of all statewide executives whereas they constitute 4.5% of all members of Congress and 5.0% of all state legislators (CAWP 2013b).

Beyond Governors Nikki Haley and Susana Martinez, there are only three white women and three men of color serving as governors in 2013.<sup>13</sup> An African American or Native American woman has yet to win gubernatorial office. Looking more broadly at statewide offices, only one woman of color had ever served in the U.S. Senate—Carol Moseley Braun of Illinois—prior to this year, when Hawaii's Mazie Hirono took her seat (CAWP 2013b). Because women of color are less well represented in state legislative and local office compared with men of color, the pool of women of color who are considered eligible for statewide office is smaller than that of men of color (Tate 1997).

The underrepresentation of minority women in statewide elective executive office is consistent with the idea that women of color are doubly disadvantaged by their location at the

---

<sup>13</sup> Data are from CAWP and the Center on the American Governor (CAWP 2013a; and Eagleton Institute of Politics website, accessed 3/5/13; <[http://governors.rutgers.edu/usgov/gov\\_fastfacts.php](http://governors.rutgers.edu/usgov/gov_fastfacts.php)>). Martin (2001) found that only 12 men of color served as governors throughout the twentieth century. The first African American to win election to gubernatorial office in the twentieth century won in Virginia in 1989, the first Latino in 1916 in New Mexico, the first Asian American in Hawaii in 1974, and the first Native American in Oklahoma in 1950 (Martin 2001). The Gender and Multicultural Leadership Project only identified a total of 17 statewide elected officials of color in their 2004 study (Hardy-Fanta et al. 2006). A total of 35 women have ever served as governors in 26 states (CAWP 2013a). The first woman elected to the governor's mansion in her own right did so in 1974 (CAWP 2013a).

intersection of gender and race inequalities. At the same time, differences in minority women's representation across levels of office indicates that research on statewide office is needed.

*Preprimary Statewide Nominating Conventions.* The first hypothesis I examine is based on past research about the negative effect of parties on candidate diversity. I expect that party leader doubts about the competitiveness of female or minority candidates for statewide office are likely to encompass women of color. To investigate this question, I analyze the effect of preprimary nominating conventions on the presence of women of color. While parties predominantly use primary elections to select statewide candidates, some states provide parties with the ability, by law, to nominate candidates through conventions.<sup>14</sup> These conventions give the endorsed candidate favorable ballot position or some other type of ballot advantage (Jewell and Morehouse 2001; Maisel and Brewer 2010). Studies have shown that states with these preprimary endorsements are less likely to experience contested or competitive primaries than other states (Maisel et al. 1998; Jewell and Morehouse 2001).

The party's ability to coalesce around a candidate may depend on the year and the constellation of candidates, and it may take multiple convention ballots to settle on a candidate (Jewell and Morehouse 2001: 110-116). The percentage of convention votes needed to achieve an endorsement varies across states; in some states, multiple candidates can enter the primary with convention support. For example, in New Mexico, candidates are designated nominees if they obtain 20% of the convention vote. In contrast, only one candidate can receive the party endorsement in Connecticut, and that candidate is noted as the party-endorsed candidate on the ballot. In some states, such as New York, candidates can petition to compete in the primary even

---

<sup>14</sup> These states are: Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, and Virginia.

if they fail to obtain sufficient support at the convention, thereby reducing the role of the party as a gatekeeper (Bott 1990).

But even though state parties may not always coalesce around a single candidate, we can still expect that party leaders will be more influential in the candidate emergence process in states with nominating conventions compared with other states, other factors being equal. In states where parties exercise more control over the nomination, I hypothesize that it will be less likely that women of color have competed as candidates compared with other states. While nominating conventions do not guarantee influence, they are an institutional mechanism for party influence and the most likely context for greater party influence over statewide nominations (Jewell and Morehouse 2001).

*Party Competition.* Party leaders are more likely to be actively involved in candidate selection for races that are expected to be competitive, making it less likely that a woman of color would be able to attract party support (Sanbonmatsu 2006a; Sanbonmatsu 2006b). Risk-averse party leaders are less likely to coalesce around candidates of nontraditional backgrounds (e.g., a candidate other than a white male candidate), other factors being equal. I therefore hypothesize that we are more likely to observe women of color candidates in states that experience lower levels of interparty competition. To operationalize party competition, I examine the extent of two-party competition in gubernatorial elections.<sup>15</sup> This measure summarizes the level of competition in previous statewide races, with the drawback that it captures the level of party competition for the office of governor rather than all statewide contests.

---

<sup>15</sup> I use the absolute value of the average vote margin between the two major parties from the three most recent gubernatorial elections (prior to 2000). This measure is similar to that used by Dowling and Lem (2009). Data on gubernatorial election results are from the CQ Voting and Elections online database <<http://library.cqpress.com/elections>>, accessed July 11, 2013.

*Sacrificial Lamb Candidates.* Because most minority women elected officials at the state and local level are Democrats, minority women who run statewide as Republicans may be doing so because of conscious recruitment by Republican party leaders. Given that previous research found that Republican female candidates for governor were more likely to be sacrificial lambs compared with Democratic female candidates for governor, this finding is likely to apply to Republican female candidates of color for statewide office. More so than the Democratic party, the Republican party has a strategic incentive to appeal to crossover voters by fielding a diverse candidate in difficult to win races. While far fewer women of color identify as Republicans than Democrats, a deep pool is not necessary to produce a single sacrificial lamb.<sup>16</sup> Because the Republican party has more to gain symbolically by nominating minority women, I expect to see more sacrificial lambs in the Republican party than the Democratic party.

While these three hypotheses posit that parties act as obstacles to minority women's candidacies, it is possible that women of color candidates face a unique set of circumstances with respect to statewide office—and even opportunities—due to their location at the intersection of race and gender categories. While I have theorized that women of color are disadvantaged in ways consistent with disadvantages faced by women candidates overall and by candidates of color overall, women candidates of color could potentially be advantaged in some ways; after all, women of color may benefit from their in-built commonality with women voters as a group and

---

<sup>16</sup> Stambough and O'Regan (2007: 360) state: "Because Democrats are more likely to nominate women to competitive gubernatorial elections, one might expect the importance of the female candidate pool to differ by political party as well. It is reasonable to believe that a strong pipeline is needed in order for women to obtain nominations to competitive seats. Since Democrats are more likely to nominate women in competitive races instead of as sacrificial lambs, we hypothesize that the pipeline theory holds—but only among Democrats. If Republicans are primarily nominating women in hopeless seat situations, a deep pool is not needed for such nominations. It takes only a pool of one to produce a sacrificial lamb." Of course, it is also the case that a deep pool may not be needed to produce a female governor: Governor Haley served in South Carolina's state legislature prior to winning election to the governor's mansion—a legislature known for having the lowest percentage of women among the 50 states. (Center for American Women and Politics. [http://cawp.rutgers.edu/fast\\_facts/resources/state\\_fact\\_sheets/SC.php](http://cawp.rutgers.edu/fast_facts/resources/state_fact_sheets/SC.php) Accessed July 1, 2013). See Annesley et al. (2012) regarding the fact that only a small number of women are needed to accomplish parity in executive office.

voters of color as a group (Tate 1997; Tate 2003; Smooth 2006; Bejarano forthcoming). Recent research points to the gendered nature of racial stereotypes, which seem to be largely driven by beliefs about minority men (Ghavami 2011; McConnaughy and White 2011). If voters' racial stereotypes and fears are primarily directed towards men of color, women candidates of color may seem less threatening, and hence more electable (Bejarano forthcoming).

If women of color are thought by party leaders to be electorally valuable—either due to the diverse party image that may be conveyed by women of color, or because of the coalition-building opportunities of women of color candidates—more party involvement in nominations might aid women of color. Meanwhile, if women of color are advantaged in states with greater two-party competition, or if they are unlikely to be sacrificial lamb candidates, then minority women may not be as disadvantaged as we might have assumed.

### **Analysis**

Data from the Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) show that women of color are achieving statewide office in an expanding list of states, although that list currently only includes 14 states (CAWP 2013b). Half of the cases of “firsts”—which I define as the first time a minority woman achieved statewide elective executive office in a state—have occurred since 2000 (see Table 1). To date, 26 women of color have held executive offices that require election from a statewide constituency.<sup>17</sup>

[Insert Table 1 about here]

A cursory investigation of these firsts for women of color confirms the importance of devoting a study to women of color—distinct from women as a group or racial minorities as a

---

<sup>17</sup> For my analysis, I only consider statewide elective executive offices in which the constituency for the office is the state rather than a district. As I show later in this paper, however, some firsts for women of color have occurred through appointment rather than election.

group, as studies of statewide office have done in the past. Between 1900 and 1999, according to CAWP data Anglo women had achieved at least one statewide elective executive position in 48 of the 50 states.<sup>18</sup> Meanwhile, men of color had achieved such offices in 23 states during that time period (Martin 2001). Thus, women of color have lagged behind white women and men of color in the range of states in which they have been able to secure these high offices.

In only one case (Hawaii) did a woman of color achieve a statewide executive office between 1900 and 1999 prior to an Anglo woman achieving such an office in that state, confirming that access to executive office varies by race/ethnicity among women. Meanwhile, four of the 14 cases of firsts for women of color represent firsts for a person of color, indicating that women of color are also differentially positioned with respect to statewide office than are men of color. The fact that there are four cases in which a woman of color was the first to shatter the racial barrier (with respect to statewide elective executive office) provides limited evidence that women of color sometimes hold an advantage over men of color.

### **State-Party Evidence**

I begin my analysis with the records of the two major parties overall before turning to a cross-sectional analysis of the 50 states. In 2013, five Democratic women of color compared with three Republican women of color hold statewide elective executive offices in which candidates must be elected statewide rather than from districts (CAWP 2013b). Although the overall number (eight) is quite small, Republican women are therefore more than one-third of these minority women of color holding statewide office from the two major parties. In contrast, just 6.9% of minority women in Congress from the two major parties are Republicans, as are

---

<sup>18</sup> The two exceptions are Maine—which has never elected a woman to its sole executive position, governor—and Hawaii.



5.8% of minority women state legislators. Among all minority female members of Congress, 27 are Democrats and just two are Republicans; among minority female state legislators across the 50 states, 344 are Democrats and 21 are Republicans (CAWP 2013b).<sup>19</sup> The pool of Republican women of color who could launch a statewide bid for office from a state legislative or congressional seat is small.

Because half of the cases of firsts for minority women achieving statewide elective executive positions have occurred since 2000 (see Table 1), I focus for the remainder of the paper on this recent period. When all women candidates (regardless of race) between 2000 and 2012 are considered, Democratic women were the majority of all women candidates who sought the nomination of a major party (57.3% were Democrats and 42.7% were Republicans).<sup>20</sup> Of these major party candidates vying for statewide executive positions, a total of 78 or 12% were women of color. The women of color who ran for statewide office were primarily Democrats (79.5%); about one-fifth (20.5%) were Republicans. While 83.2% of Democratic women running statewide were white, 16.8% were women of color; among Republican women, 94.3% were white and only 5.7% were women of color. Thus, Democratic women of color are dramatically outpacing Republican women of color as statewide candidates.

Restricting the analysis to serious candidates (i.e., candidates who garnered at least 5% of the primary vote or who won the nomination through a preprimary convention), CAWP's data show that there were a total of 72 women of color who sought a major party nomination across 27 states between 2000 and 2012; conversely, in 23 states, no woman of color competed. In 21

---

<sup>19</sup> Voters who are women of color also favor the Democratic party (Carroll 2010). For example, while the majority of white women (56%) voted for Mitt Romney in 2012, women of color—including 96% of Black women and 76% of Latinas—overwhelmingly supported Barack Obama (CAWP 2012).

<sup>20</sup> All data are from CAWP and are for the 50 states. Between 2009 and 2012, I have found that women of color were 3.5% of all general election candidates in partisan contests; women (regardless of race) were 24% of candidates. According to data from NALEO, Latinas were five of 18 general election candidates in 2010; according to the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, women were six of 12 African American general election candidates in 2010.

states, at least one woman of color won the nomination of a major party. Thus, a major problem regarding minority women's underrepresentation in statewide offices is that just over half of states did not experience a woman of color competing as a major party nominee.<sup>21</sup> Only nine states experienced a major party woman of color winner during this time period.

Turning to my central hypotheses about party politics, I first consider the question of sacrificial lamb candidates. I employ a simple definition that treats challengers to incumbents from the opposing party as sacrificial lambs.

I find few cases of women of color securing the nomination for sacrificial lamb contests. Among the 72 serious women of color candidates, only 35 ran as nonincumbent party nominees between 2000 and 2012. Just three Republican women of color were nominees for what might be considered hopeless races, or 30% of the nonincumbent nominees. Only 25 total Democratic women of color were nonincumbent nominees. Ten of them (40%) were challengers. Thus I do not find support for my hypothesis that women of color are disproportionately slated as sacrificial lambs in the Republican party compared with the Democratic party. Indeed, one of the three Republican women of color challengers won, whereas none of the Democratic women of color challengers did so.

I turn next to the role of state laws that provide for preprimary nominating conventions. I ask whether the existence of a convention is related to the presence of at least one minority female candidate in the primary, the general election, or as a general election winner between 2000 and 2012. While these three measures overlap to some extent, each measure captures a different aspect of a state's experience with women of color candidates. For example, although

---

<sup>21</sup> Among these 72 cases, the two largest subgroups of women were African American women (50%) and Latinas (29.2%). Of the 72 cases, most candidacies were for what could be considered a top statewide office (e.g., governor, lt. governor, treasurer, attorney general, secretary of state). Of the women of color candidates, most (56.9%) were open-seat candidates, with 16.7% running as incumbents and 26.4% as challengers. A large proportion of cases are from New Mexico, which saw 12 women of color candidates during this time period.

winning office is the ultimate goal, the presence of women of color statewide candidates—even if they are not ultimately successful—is symbolically significant. Meanwhile, the ability of women of color to secure the party nomination is a distinct measure and attests to the presence of widespread party support.

A limitation of these candidate data is that we may not observe women of color who sought the party nomination at a statewide convention but failed to receive it, or who failed to attract sufficient party support in a given state to enter the primary.<sup>22</sup> For this reason, I analyze state-party dyads. By treating the state-party as the unit of analysis and considering whether a female candidate of color emerges in a given state and party, I am able to indirectly evaluate the relationship between state parties and female candidates of color. In doing so, I want to shift the analysis of women of color from a focus on an individual candidate's background to a focus on the states and parties that produce candidates and officeholders (Dhamoon 2011).

Table 2 presents the bivariate relationship between the existence of a legal provision for statewide party nominating conventions and a state's experience with at least one minority female primary candidate, party nominee, or general election winner. For example, the first row indicates that nearly half of states (46.2%) without statewide primary nominating conventions experienced at least one female minority Democratic candidate, which is not dramatically different from the percentage for states—54.6%—that use conventions. No statistically significant association is evident for either the Democratic or Republican party.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

---

<sup>22</sup> An alternative strategy is to examine ambition at the individual level, which is the technique of Richard Fox and Jennifer Lawless in their important studies of potential candidates (e.g., Fox and Lawless 2005; Lawless and Fox 2010). On the role of race and gender in shaping ambition among citizen potential candidates, see Lawless (2012). Using the Citizen Political Ambition Panel Study, Lawless finds that African American citizens are more likely than Latinos or whites to have seriously considered running for office, although she also finds that gender gaps in ambition persist across racial groups. On the question of whether women of color fit a traditional ambition framework, and whether they may prefer to focus on the local level, see Lien and Swain (2013).

I also compared the mean levels of the gubernatorial vote margin variable for states with and without at least one woman of color candidate or winner. Although there were no significant differences in two-party competition when I compared states with at least one Republican woman of color candidate or winner with other states, the findings were different for Democrats. Two of the comparisons were statistically significant: states with a female Democratic candidate of color in the primary had experienced narrower gubernatorial margins of victory in past elections than states without such candidates, and the same was the case for states that experienced Democratic women of color nominees. At first glance, then, there is some evidence of a relationship between two-party competition and the candidacies of women of color, although it is in the opposite direction than I had hypothesized.

Turning to a multivariate analysis, I use a dataset consisting of state-party dyads to analyze the dependent variables: having experienced at least one female minority primary candidate; a party nominee; or a general election winner for statewide office (see Table 3). The main independent variables of interest are preprimary nominating conventions and party competition. I expect the preprimary nominating conventions dummy variable to be negatively signed and that higher values on the party competition measure (indicating lower competition) will be positively associated with women of color candidates.

To control for other factors that may explain state variation in the presence of women of color candidates, I take state diversity into account in two ways. I created a measure of state legislator diversity, which is the percentage of state legislators as of 2000 who are female and/or people of color; this measure succinctly captures the electorate's willingness to support candidates other than the typical candidates, who are white males.<sup>23</sup> I also examine the diversity

---

<sup>23</sup> As Hughes (2013) argues, the proportion of majority men in a legislature is an indicator of a state's status quo with respect to race and gender. State legislative data were compiled from 2000 CAWP data, data from the Joint

of the state population given the importance of race/ethnicity for understanding the election of candidates of color to public office, including women of color (Hardy-Fanta et al. 2006). While the presence of women in the population does not vary substantially across states, the racial/ethnic population does. Because the measures of racial/gender diversity of state legislators and the racial diversity of the state population measure are highly correlated ( $r=.72$ ), I analyze these measures separately, consistent with past studies of minority representation.

I include a dummy variable for the Democratic party given the presence of more Democratic than Republican women candidates of color. Finally, I control for the total number of statewide elective executive offices in each state; states with more offices—and therefore more opportunities—should be more likely to incorporate nontraditional candidates such as women of color.<sup>24</sup>

The cross-sectional analyses displayed in Table 3 tell the same story as the previous table, which is the lack of evidence of a systematic relationship between statewide party nominating conventions and the status of women candidates of color.<sup>25</sup> No relationship—be it positive or negative—is evident between preprimary conventions and the experience of having a woman of color competing for high office. Turning to the party competition measure, I also find no significant relationship between the degree of two-party competition and the status of women of color, controlling for other factors.

---

Center for Political and Economic Studies, NALEO (1999) and the UCLA Asian American Studies Center (2000-2001). U.S. Census data are for 2000 (Humes et al. 2011).

<sup>24</sup> I used the Council of State Government's *Book of the States* and state websites to assemble the data on statewide offices.

<sup>25</sup> Given the small size of my sample (N=100), I include a limited number of independent variables in the model. However, the lack of significant effects for preprimary nominating conventions and party competition persist in a series of alternative specifications. Adding controls for the existence of term limits for statewide offices, region (south), and a state's history with men of color in statewide elective executive office did not change the results. Employing the folded Ranney index of state party competition (Shufeldt and Flavin 2012), or an alternative measure (major party 2000 presidential vote margin), yield the same results. Note that I exclude LA and WA from the party nominee analysis because they use the top-two primary system.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

The control variables in Table 3 generally behave as expected. Women of color candidates and winners are more likely to be Democrats than Republicans. More diverse states—captured either through state legislative diversity or the racial diversity of the state population—are more likely to experience women of color statewide candidates. These effects indicate that more diverse states are more willing to elect women of color and/or that those states contain a larger pool of potential candidates.<sup>26</sup>

### **Pathways to Statewide Elective Executive Office: Cases**

Before concluding I briefly review the successes of women of color statewide officeholders in order to help interpret the multivariate results. In Table 4, I summarize the circumstances and backgrounds of all women of color who achieved statewide elective executive office, including the dates of service, circumstances of their ascension to office, party affiliation, and race/ethnicity (CAWP 2013b). The table makes clear that one state—New Mexico—is a leader for successful women of color in politics, for both Democratic and Republican women. Six women of color—all Latinas—have achieved statewide office in New Mexico, including one of the first two women of color to win gubernatorial office in U.S. history. Because New Mexico represents such a large number of cases and statewide officeholding by women of color there dates back to the 1920s, it is unique among the 50 states.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, I will focus on an analysis of the other states in the table which leaves 16 partisan cases.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

---

<sup>26</sup> This result departs from Hero (1998), who found a negative relationship between state diversity and minority state legislative officeholding.

<sup>27</sup> Because Latinos have always had access to elective office in New Mexico, this incorporation may explain why Atkins et al. (2012) did not find evidence of coethnic voting for Latina candidate Susana Martinez in the 2010 gubernatorial election.

With the caveat that it is difficult to generalize from such a small number of cases, three preliminary observations are apparent. First, the cases in Table 4 help to explain why the use of preprimary nominating conventions does not appear to harm minority women's candidacies—although such conventions do not appear to be beneficial either. If we look beyond New Mexico (which uses preprimary nominating conventions), in three of the 16 cases of successful women officeholders from the major parties, winning the nomination at the party convention helped them achieve their positions (in Colorado, Connecticut, and Indiana).<sup>28</sup> In two of these three cases (Connecticut and Indiana), racial minorities do not comprise a large proportion of the state population. In two other cases (in Delaware and Indiana, both involving Democratic women), women of color achieved office via appointment rather than election. Interestingly, there are two cases of a woman of color reaching office after being selected as the gubernatorial candidate's running mate.

Together, these seven successes mean that nearly half of the women of color in Table 4 (setting aside New Mexico) have achieved office with party support obtained at a party convention (prior to or in lieu of a primary) or via selection by the governor or gubernatorial candidate rather than as an individual competitor in a primary. In other words, while entering a primary is the most common way that women of color have reached statewide elective executive office, the number of women of color who have taken that pathway nearly equals the total number who achieved office through some other means (i.e., a convention, appointment, or selection as a running mate).

Second, despite the overwhelming Democratic loyalties of women of color in the electorate, women of color statewide officials have not been exclusively Democratic. New

---

<sup>28</sup> Although New Mexico uses preprimary conventions, Gimpel (1996) argues that the parties cannot control nominations in the state and describes its elections as candidate-centered rather than party-centered.

Mexico aside, Republican women of color in statewide elective office are unusual, constituting only five of 16 major party cases. If one looks at the cases where women of color have achieved statewide office unexpectedly, Florida, Ohio, and South Carolina stand out.<sup>29</sup> In the wake of Governor Mark Sanford's extramarital affair in 2010, Nikki Haley won a three-way primary and runoff to become the first woman and first person of color to serve as governor of South Carolina.

However, the other two cases involve a white male Republican gubernatorial nominee selecting a woman of color as his running mate. One of the lieutenant governor selections was for a competitive race, while the other was not competitive. In Florida, candidate Rick Scott selected Jennifer Carroll to be his running mate in 2010; Carroll is a veteran and was the first African American female state legislator from the Republican party.<sup>30</sup> Scott and Carroll narrowly won the election, making Carroll the first African American to win election to statewide office and the first woman to be elected to the office of lieutenant governor. Meanwhile, in Ohio, Governor Bob Taft selected an African American city councilwoman, Jennette Bradley, as his running mate for his reelection bid in 2002. This selection occurred after the Democratic candidate Tim Hagan selected Charleta Tavares—who was an African American city councilwoman—to be his running mate. In that case, the Republican ticket easily won the race.<sup>31</sup> Bradley became the first woman of color to hold statewide office in Ohio.

These cases have some idiosyncratic features to them and are not necessarily evidence of a larger pattern. However, they do show that Republican women of color can be successful and

---

<sup>29</sup> These cases are outliers in the multivariate analysis of party nominees from Table 3.

<sup>30</sup> Carroll resigned from her position as lieutenant governor in 2013.

<sup>31</sup> The first African American statewide officeholder in Ohio, Kenneth Blackwell, was appointed treasurer by Republican Governor George V. Voinovich in 1993, apparently after Jennette Bradley declined the appointment. Prior to the 2002 contest, Tavares had sought and lost statewide office. Democratic gubernatorial candidates (both Anglo men) had run with African American male running mates in 1994 and 1998, though the tickets were unsuccessful in both cases.



that party recruitment has been an important mechanism. In contrast, no woman of color has been elected governor on the Democratic side, and only in Hawaii have Democratic women of color served as lieutenant governor.

Third, Table 4 shows that women of color statewide elected officials hail from a range of backgrounds. Although most common is officeholding at the local or county level or as a state legislator, some women have come from a background in state government. Thus although it is a common credential, state legislative experience is not the only route to statewide office for women of color. Overall, this table also demonstrates that a large pool of women of color local and state legislative officeholders in a state is not necessary to yield a woman of color statewide official.

## **Conclusion**

This paper brings some encouraging news for women of color candidates. First, the status of women of color as statewide executive candidates and officeholders is improving; women of color are holding office at historically high levels. Minority women—78 in total—sought a major party nomination between 2000 and 2012. Women of color are more likely to run in states with more racially diverse populations in which nontraditional politicians (i.e., women and minorities) have been more likely to secure state legislative seats. A handful of women of color have achieved office in states without large minority populations.

Second, and contrary to my hypotheses, there is no clear-cut relationship between preprimary nominating conventions or party competition and the candidacies and election of women of color to statewide office. A limitation of the multivariate analysis is that the existence of statewide nominating conventions is a blunt measure of party influence; in some cases,

candidates can petition in order to appear on the primary ballot if they fail to win sufficient convention support, weakening party control over the nomination. We also do not observe the informal candidate selection processes that take place within states early in the election cycle in which potential candidates may be encouraged, or discouraged, by party leaders.

The null results may mean that statewide nominating conventions are a mixed blessing for women candidates of color. On one hand, conventions could provide an opportunity for party activists to rely on stereotypes as they assess potential candidates (Bos 2011). Party leaders are likely to be more influential in nominating conventions than in a primary, and those leaders are likely to be skeptical about the statewide viability of women of color candidates. On the other hand, competing within the party ranks at a convention may be less expensive than running in a statewide primary; this aspect of conventions may aid women of color who as a group tend to be disadvantaged with respect to resources (Caul and Tate 2002; Johnson et al. 2012). Moreover, Jewell (1984) finds that statewide nominating conventions provide the party with an opportunity to create a balanced slate; while Jewell discussed balancing by ethnicity or region of a state, one can imagine the appeal of using the convention setting to try to balance on the dimensions of race and gender.<sup>32</sup>

Third, although there are very few Republican women of color competing for statewide executive office, it does not appear to be the case that these women candidates are doing so as sacrificial lambs.

We have also seen findings that are more discouraging for women of color candidates. Women of color are underrepresented compared with their presence in the population, and the access that women of color have to statewide office is more limited than for other offices such as

---

<sup>32</sup> The gubernatorial candidate's selection of a running mate also provides a balancing opportunity (Fox and Oxley 2005).

congressional and state legislative office. While there are a handful of cases where a woman of color achieved statewide elective executive office prior to a white woman or man of color, for the most part women of color lag behind those two groups. The scarcity of women candidates of color is part of the problem, as most states did not experience a serious woman candidate of color compete for a major party nomination during the period of this study. We have also seen that the status and pattern of statewide officeholding by women of color is distinct from that of white women and men of color.

Of the women of color who have competed, won the nomination, and been successful, most are Democrats. The success of any Republican women of color for these high offices—including the very first women of color to become governors—is therefore surprising. With some recent calls for a more demographically diverse Republican party—including more efforts to recruit female and minority candidates—it is possible that women of color will increase their leverage within the Republican party (Republican National Committee 2013). Indeed, Governor Susana Martinez has been enlisted to help her party with the recruitment of more diverse candidates through a “Future Majority Project.”

The visible success of these Republican women of color shines a spotlight on the shortfalls of the Democratic party. After all, women of color are 30.7% of all Democratic women state legislators (CAWP 2013b). Although state legislative officeholding is not a prerequisite for running for statewide executive office, these women of color state legislators are a natural pool of women who might launch bids for statewide office; with women of color constituting just under 17% of Democratic women candidates for statewide executive office in recent years, there appear to be more eligible women of color within the states.

With the increasing racial diversity of the population and gains of women of color in local and state politics, statewide candidacies by women of color should become more common. It remains to be seen, however, whether the state Democratic and Republican parties will facilitate minority women's representation.

## Sources

- Alexander-Floyd, N. G. (2007). *Gender, Race, and Nationalism in Contemporary Black Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Annesley, C., Beckwith, K., Engeli, I., & Franceschet, S. (2012). Theoretical Perspectives on Gender and Executive Leadership. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
- Avery, J. M. & Fine, J. A. (2012). Racial Composition, White Racial Attitudes, and Black Representation: Testing the Racial Threat Hypothesis in the United States Senate. *Political Behavior*, 34, 391-410.
- Baer, D. L. (2003). Women, Women's Organizations, and Political Parties. In S. J. Carroll (Ed.), *Women and American Politics: New Questions, New Directions* (pp. 111-145). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Barbara Lee Family Foundation. 2001. *Keys to the Governor's Office*.  
<http://www.barbaraleefoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/Keys-to-the-Governors-Office.pdf>
- Barrett, E. J. (2001). Black Women in State Legislatures: The Relationship of Race and Gender to the Legislative Experience. In S. J. Carroll (Ed.), *The Impact of Women in Public Office* (pp. 185-204). Indiana University Press.
- Bejarano, C. (Forthcoming). *The Latina Advantage: Gender, Race, and Political Success*. University of Texas Press.
- Bejarano, C. & Segura, G. (2007). What Goes Around, Comes Around: Race, Blowback, and the Louisiana Elections of 2002 and 2003. *Political Research Quarterly*, 60, 328-337.
- Beltran, C. (2010). *The Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beyle, T. (2011). Gubernatorial Elections, Campaign Costs and Powers. In *Book of the States 2011*. Lexington, KY: Council of State Governments.
- Bos, A. (2011). Out of Control: Delegates' Information Sources and Perceptions of Female Candidates. *Political Communication*, 28, 87-109.
- Bott, A. J. (1990). *Handbook of United States Election Laws and Practices: Political Rights*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bratton, K. A., Haynie, K. L., & Reingold, B. (2006). Agenda Setting and African American Women in State Legislatures. *Journal of Women Politics & Policy*, 28, 71-96.

- Burrell, B. (1994). *A Woman's Place is in the House: Campaigning for Congress in the Feminist Era*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Burrell, B. (1993). Party Decline, Party Transformation, and Gender Politics: The U.S.A. In J. Lovenduski & P. Norris (Eds.), *Gender and Party Politics* (pp. 291-308). London: Sage.
- Caliendo, S. M. & McIlwain, C. D. (2006). Minority Candidates, Media Framing, and Racial Cues in the 2004 Election. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 11, 45-69.
- Carmines, E. G. & Stimson, J. A. (1989). *Issue Evolution: Race and the Transformation of American Politics*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Carroll, S. J. & Sanbonmatsu, K. (2013). *More Women Can Run: Gender and Pathways to the State Legislatures*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carroll, S. J. (2010). Voting Choices: The Politics of the Gender Gap. In S. J. Carroll & R. L. Fox (Eds.), *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics* (pp. 117-143). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carroll, S. J. & Strimling, W. S. (1983). *Women's Routes to Elective Office: A Comparison with Men's*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for the American Woman and Politics.
- Casellas, J. P. (2011). *Latino Representation in State Houses and Congress*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Caul, M. & Tate, K. (2002). Thinner Ranks: Women as Candidates and California's Blanket Primary. In B. E. Cain & E. R. Gerber (Eds.), *Voting at the Political Fault Line: California's Experiment with the Blanket Primary* (pp. 234-247). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP). (2000). Women of Color in Elective Office 2000. New Brunswick, NJ, Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), National Information Bank on Women in Public Office, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.
- Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP). (2012). Women's Votes Decisive in 2012 Presidential Race. Press Release. New Brunswick, NJ, Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP). 7 November.
- Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP). (2013a). Statewide Elective Executive Women 2013. New Brunswick, NJ, Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), National Information Bank on Women in Public Office, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.

- Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP). (2013b). *Women of Color in Elective Office 2013*. New Brunswick, NJ, Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP), National Information Bank on Women in Public Office, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.
- Cohen, C. (2003). A Portrait of Continuing Marginality: The Study of Women of Color in American Politics. In S. J. Carroll (Ed.), *Women and American Politics: New Questions, New Directions*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, M., et al. (2008). *The Party Decides: Presidential Nominations Before and After Reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. (Rev. 10th anniversary ed.) New York: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 129, 139-167.
- Crowder-Meyer, M. (2010). *Local Parties, Local Candidates, and Women's Representation: How County Parties Affect Who Runs for and Wins Political Office*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Princeton University.
- Dade, C. (2011). Republicans Make Gains With Latino Candidates. NPR [On-line]. <http://www.npr.org/2011/07/25/138602984/republicans-make-gains-with-latino-candidates>
- Darcy, R. & Hadley, C. D. (1988). Black Women in Politics: The Puzzle of Success. *Social Science Quarterly*, 69, 629-645.
- de la Garza, R. O. (2004). Latino Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 91-123.
- Dhamoon, R. K. (2011). Considerations on Mainstreaming Intersectionality. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64, 230-243.
- Dittmar, K. (2013). Turning the Tables: Behind Every Successful Woman. In M. Rose (Ed.), *Women and Executive Office: Pathways and Performance* (pp. 231-256). Boulder, CO.
- Dittmar, K. (2012). *Campaigns as Gendered Institutions: Stereotypes and Strategy in Statewide Races*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Rutgers University.
- Dowling, C. A. & Lem, S. B. (2009). Explaining Major and Third Party Candidate Entry in US Gubernatorial Elections, 1980-2005. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 9, 1-23.

- Duerst-Lahti, G. (2006). Presidential Elections: Gendered Space and the Case of 2004. In S. J. Carroll & R. L. Fox (Eds.), *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics* (pp. 12-42). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Elder, L. (2012). The Partisan Gap Among Women State Legislators. *Journal of Women Politics & Policy*, 33, 65-85.
- Fauntroy, M. K. (2007). *Republicans and the Black Vote*. (Paperback ed.) Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Fox, R. L. & Lawless, J. L. (2010). If Only They'd Ask: Gender, Recruitment, and Political Ambition. *Journal of Politics*, 72, 310-326.
- Fox, R. L. & Lawless, J. L. (2005). To Run or Not to Run for Office: Explaining Nascent Political Ambition. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49, 642-659.
- Fox, R. L. & Oxley, Z. M. (2003). Gender Stereotyping in State Executive Elections: Candidate Selection and Success. *Journal of Politics*, 65, 833-850.
- Fox, R. L. & Oxley, Z. M. (2005). Does Running with a Woman Help? Evidence from U.S. Gubernatorial Elections. *Politics & Gender*, 1, 525-546.
- Fraga, L. R., Lopez, L., Martinez-Ebers, V., & Ramirez, R. (2008). Representing Gender and Ethnicity: Strategic Intersectionality. In B. Reingold (Ed.), *Legislative Women: Getting Elected, Getting Ahead* (pp. 157-174). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Fraga, L. R., Lopez, L., Martinez-Ebers, V., & Ramirez, R. (2006/2007). Gender and Ethnicity: Patterns of Electoral Success and Legislative Advocacy among Latina and Latino State Officials in Four States. *Journal of Women Politics & Policy*, 28, 121-145.
- Fraga, L. R. & Leal, D. L. (2004). Playing the 'Latino Card': Race, Ethnicity, and National Party Politics. *DuBois Review*, 1, 297-317.
- Frederick, K. A. & Jeffries, J. L. (2009). A Study in African American Candidates for High-Profile Statewide Office. *Journal of Black Studies*, 39, 689-718.
- Frymer, P. (1999). *Uneasy Alliances: Race and Party Competition in America*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Gamble, K. (2010). Young, Gifted, Black, and Female: Why Aren't There More Yvette Clarkes in Congress? In A. Gillespie (Ed.), *Whose Black Politics? Cases in Post-Racial Black Leadership* (pp. 293-308). New York: Routledge.
- Garcia Bedolla, L. (2007). Intersections of Inequality: Understanding Marginalization and Privilege in the Post-Civil Rights Era. *Politics & Gender*, 3, 232-248.



- Garcia Bedolla, L., Tate, K., & Wong, J. (2005). Indelible Effects: The Impact of Women of Color in the U.S. Congress. In S. Thomas & C. Wilcox (Eds.), *Women and Election to Office: Past, Present, and Future, Second Edition* (pp. 152-175). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garcia, S. R., et al. (2008). *Politiclas: Latina Public Officials in Texas*. (1st ed.) Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ghavami, N. & Peplau, L. A. (2013). An Intersectional Analysis of Gender and Ethnic Stereotypes: Testing Three Hypotheses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37, 113-127.
- Ghavami, N. (2011). *Stereotyping and Bias: The Nexus of Gender and Ethnicity*. Ph.D. Dissertation. U.C.L.A.
- Giddings, P. (1984). *When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America*. (1st ed.) New York: W. Morrow.
- Gill, L. M. (1997). *African American Women in Congress: Forming and Transforming History*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Gimpel, J. G. (1996). *National Elections and the Autonomy of American State Party Systems*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Grofman, B. (1998). *Race and Redistricting in the 1990s*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Gurin, P., Hatchett, S., & Jackson, J. S. (1989). *Hope and Independence: Blacks' Response to Electoral and Party Politics*. New York: R. Sage Foundation.
- Hajnal, Z. & Lee, T. (2011). *Why Americans Don't Join the Party: Race, Immigration, and the Failure (of Political Parties) to Engage the Electorate*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Hajnal, Z. (2007). *Changing White Attitudes toward Black Political Leadership*. Cambridge England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hancock, A.-M. (2007). When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5, 63-79.
- Hardy-Fanta, C., Lien, P., Pinderhughes, D. M., & Sierra, C. M. (2006). Gender, Race, and Descriptive Representation in the United States: Findings from the Gender and Multicultural Leadership Project. *Journal of Women Politics & Policy*, 28, 7-41.
- Harris-Perry, M. V. (2011). *Sister Citizen: Shame, Stereotypes, and Black Women in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Harris, F. (2012). *The Price of the Ticket: Barack Obama and Rise and Decline of Black Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hero, R. E. (1998). *Faces of Inequality: Social Diversity in American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Highton, B. (2004). White Voters and African American Candidates for Congress. *Political Behavior*, 26, 1-25.
- Hochschild, J. L., Weaver, V. M., & Burch, T. R. (2012). *Creating a New Racial Order: How Immigration, Multiracialism, Genomics, and the Young Can Remake Race in America*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Hughes, M. (2013). Diversity in National Legislatures Around the World. *Sociology Compass*, 7, 23-33.
- Hughes, M. (2012). The Intersection of Gender and Minority Status in National Legislatures: The Minority Women Legislative Index. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*.
- Humes, K. R., Jones, N. A., & Ramirez, R. R. (2011). *Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010* U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau.
- Hutchings, V. L. (2009). Change or More of the Same? Evaluating Racial Attitudes in the Obama Era. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 73, 917-942.
- Hutchings, V. L., Valentino, N. A., Philpot, T. S., & White, I. K. (2004). The Compassion Strategy: Race and the Gender Gap in Campaign 2000. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68, 512-541.
- Jalalzai, F. (2008). Women Rule: Shattering the Executive Glass Ceiling. *Politics & Gender*, 4, 205-231.
- Jeffries, J. L. & Wavro, M. A. (2011). Can African Americans Win High-Profile Statewide Offices in the South? A Study in Southern Inhospitality. *Journal of African American Studies*, 15, 415-432.
- Jewell, M. E. & Morehouse, S. M. (2001). *Political Parties and Elections in American States*. (4th ed.) Washington, D.C: CQ Press.
- Jewell, M. E. (1984). *Parties and Primaries: Nominating State Governors*. New York: Praeger.
- Johnson, G., Oppenheimer, B. I., & Selin, J. L. (2012). The House as a Stepping Stone to the Senate: Why Do So Few African American House Members Run? *American Journal of Political Science*, 56, 387-399.

- Junn, J. (2009). Making Room for Women of Color: Race and Gender Categories in the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election. *Politics & Gender*, 5, 105-110.
- Junn, J. & Brown, N. (2008). What Revolution? Incorporating Intersectionality in Women and Politics. In C. Wolbrecht, K. Beckwith, & L. Baldez (Eds.), *Political Women and American Democracy* (pp. 64-78). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, C. J. (1999). The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics & Society*, 27, 105-138.
- Kim, T. P. (2007). *The Racial Logic of Politics: Asian Americans and Party Competition*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- King, D. K. (1988). Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology. *Signs*, 14, 42-72.
- LaRaja, R. (2010). Party Nominating Procedures and Recruitment--State and Local Level. In *The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interest Groups*, Eds. L. Sandy Maisel and Jeffrey M. Berry. New York: Oxford University Press. (pp. 164-184). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lawless, J. L. (2012). *Becoming a Candidate: Political Ambition and the Decision to Run for Office*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawless, J. L. & Fox, R. L. (2010). *It Still Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. (Rev. ed.) New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lien, P. & Swain, K. (2013). Local Executive Leaders: At the Intersection of Race and Gender. In M. Rose (Ed.), *Women and Executive Office: Pathways and Performance* (pp. 137-156). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Lien, P., Hardy-Fanta, C., Pinderhughes, D. M., & Sierra, C. M. (2008). Expanding Categorization at the Intersection of Race and Gender: 'Women of Color' as a Political Category for African American, Latina, Asian American, and American Indian Women. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA.
- Lublin, D. (1997). *The Paradox of Representation: Racial Gerrymandering and Minority Interests in Congress*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Maisel, L. S. & Brewer, M. D. (2010). *Parties and Elections in America: The Electoral Process*. (5th ed.) Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mansbridge, J. (1999). Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent "Yes". *Journal of Politics*, 61, 628-657.

- Martin, M. (2001). *The Almanac of Women and Minorities in American Politics, 2002*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Matland, R. E. & King, D. C. (2002). Women as Candidates in Congressional Elections. In C. S. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Women Transforming Congress* (pp. 119-145). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- McClain, P. D., Carter, N. M., & Brady, M. C. (2005). Gender and Black Presidential Politics: From Chisholm to Moseley Braun. *Women and Politics, 27*, 51-68.
- McConaughy, C. & White, I. (2011). Racial Politics Complicated: The Work of Gendered Race Cues in American Politics. Paper presented at the New Research on Gender in Political Psychology Conference, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Mendelberg, T. (2001). *The Race Card: Campaign Strategy, Implicit Messages, and the Norm of Equality*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Niven, D. (1998). *The Missing Majority: The Recruitment of Women as State Legislative Candidates*. Westport, Conn: Praeger.
- Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial Formation in the United States From the 1960s to the 1990s*. (2nd ed.) New York: Routledge.
- Orey, B. D., Smooth, W., Adams, K. S., & Harris-Clark, K. (2006). Race and Gender Matter: Refining Models of Legislative Policy Making in State Legislatures. *Journal of Women Politics & Policy, 28*, 97-119.
- Oxley, Z. M. & Fox, R. L. (2004). Women in Executive Office: Variation across American States. *Political Research Quarterly, 57*, 113-120.
- Palmer, B. & Simon, D. M. (2012). *Women and Congressional Elections: A Century of Change*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Pasek, J., et al. (2009). Determinants of Turnout and Candidate Choice in the 2008 US Presidential Election Illuminating the Impact of Racial Prejudice and Other Considerations. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 73*, 943-994.
- Philpot, T. S. & Walton, H. (2007). One of Our Own: Black Female Candidates and the Voters who Support Them. *American Journal of Political Science, 51*, 49-62.
- Philpot, T. S. (2007). *Race, Republicans & the Return of the Party of Lincoln*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Piston, S. (2010). How Explicit Racial Prejudice Hurt Obama in the 2008 Election. *Political Behavior, 32*, 431-451.

- Prestage, J. L. (1977). Black Women State Legislators: A Profile. In M. Githens & J. L. Prestage (Eds.), *A Portrait of Marginality: The Political Behavior of the American Woman*; (pp. 401-418). New York: McKay.
- Reeves, K. (1997). *Voting Hopes or Fears? White Voters, Black Candidates & Racial Politics in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reingold, B. & Smith, A. R. (2012). Welfare Policymaking and Intersections of Race, Ethnicity, and Gender in U.S. State Legislatures. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56, 131-147.
- Republican National Committee (2013). Growth and Opportunity Project. [http://growthopp.gov.com/RNC\\_Growth\\_Opportunity\\_Book\\_2013.pdf](http://growthopp.gov.com/RNC_Growth_Opportunity_Book_2013.pdf) [On-line]. Available: [http://growthopp.gov.com/RNC\\_Growth\\_Opportunity\\_Book\\_2013.pdf](http://growthopp.gov.com/RNC_Growth_Opportunity_Book_2013.pdf)
- Sanbonmatsu, K. (Forthcoming). Electing Women of Color: The Role of Campaign Trainings. *Journal of Women Politics & Policy*.
- Sanbonmatsu, K. (2006a). "The Legislative Party and Candidate Recruitment in the States." *Party Politics* 12 (March): 233-256.
- Sanbonmatsu, K. (2006b). *Where Women Run: Gender and Party in the American States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sanbonmatsu, K., Carroll, S. J., & Walsh, D. (2009). *Poised to Run: Women's Pathways to the State Legislatures* Center for American Women and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University.
- Schaffner, B. F. (2011). Racial Salience and the Obama Vote. *Political Psychology*, 32, 963-988.
- Scola, B. (2006). Women of Color in State Legislatures: Gender, Race, Ethnicity and Legislative Office Holding. *Journal of Women Politics & Policy*, 28, 43-70.
- Segura, G. & Fraga, L. R. (2008). Race and the Recall: Racial and Ethnic Polarization in the California Recall Election. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52, 421-435.
- Shufeldt, G. & Flavin, P. (2012). Two Distinct Concepts: Party Competition in Government and Electoral Competition in the American States. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 12, 330-342.
- Sigelman, C. K., Sigelman, L., Walkosz, B. J., & Nitz, M. (1995). Black Candidates, White Voters: Understanding Racial Bias in Political Perceptions. *American Journal of Political Science*, 39, 243-265.
- Skocpol, T. & Williamson, V. (2012). *The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Smooth, W. (2010). African American Women and Electoral Politics: A Challenge to the Post-Race Rhetoric of the Obama Moment. In S. J. Carroll & R. L. Fox (Eds.), *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics* (pp. 165-186). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smooth, W. (2006). Intersectionality in Electoral Politics: A Mess Worth Making. *Politics & Gender*, 2, 400-414.
- Sonenshein, R. J. (1990). Can Black Candidates Win Statewide Elections? *Political Science Quarterly*, 105, 219-241.
- Stambough, S. J. & O'Regan, V. R. (2007). Republican Lambs and the Democratic Pipeline: Partisan Differences in the Nomination of Female Gubernatorial Candidates. *Politics & Gender*, 3, 349-368.
- Tate, K. (2003). *Black Faces in the Mirror: African Americans and their Representatives in the U.S. Congress*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tate, K. (1997). African American Female Senatorial Candidates: Twin Assets of Double Liabilities? In H. Walton, Jr. (Ed.), *African American Power and Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Tate, K. (1994). *From Protest to Politics: The New Black Voters in American Elections*. (Enl. ed.) New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tesler, M. (2012). The Spillover of Racialization into Health Care: How President Obama Polarized Public Opinion by Racial Attitudes and Race. *American Journal of Political Science*, 5, 690-705.
- Tesler, M. & Sears, D. O. (2010). *Obama's Race: The 2008 Election and the Dream of a Post-Racial America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Trounstein, J. & Valdini, M. (2008). The Context Matters: The Effects of Single-Member versus At-Large Districts on City Council Diversity. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52, 554-569.
- UCLA Asian American Studies Center. (2000-2001). *National Asian Pacific American Political Almanac 2000-2001: Special Election Edition*. Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center.
- White, D. G. (1999). *Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves, 1894-1994*. (1st ed.) New York: W.W. Norton.
- Windett, J. H. (2011). State Effects and the Emergence and Success of Female Gubernatorial Candidates. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*, 11, 460-482.

Wong, J., Ramakrishnan, K., Lee, T., & Junn, J. (2011). *Asian American Political Participation: Emerging Constituents and their Political Identities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wong, J. (2006). *Democracy's Promise: Immigrants & American Civic Institutions*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

**Table 1. Statewide Elective Executive Officeholding by Women of Color, Historical\***

State	Number of Women of Color by Party			Offices Held	First year of officeholding <sup>+</sup>
	Democrats	Republicans	Total		
NM	6	2	8	Governor; Secretary of State; Attorney General	1923
CA	2	0	2	Attorney General; Secretary of State	1975
HI	2	0	2	Lt. Governor	1979
NV	1	1	2	Secretary of State; Attorney General	1991
IN	2	0	2	Attorney General	1993
CO	0	1	1	Secretary of State	1995
CT	1	0	1	Treasurer	1999
OH	0	2	2**	Lt. Governor; Treasurer	2003
OR	0	0	1 (NP)	Supt. Public Instruction	2003
DE	1	0	1	Treasurer	2009
MT	1	0	1	Supt. Public Instruction	2009
AZ	1	0	1	Corporation Commissioner	2009
FL	0	1	1	Lt. Governor	2011
SC	0	1	1	Governor	2011
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>26</b>		

Note: NP is nonpartisan.

Source: CAWP 2013b.

<sup>+</sup> The first year a statewide elective executive office was held by a woman of color.

\* This table only includes offices that are elected by statewide constituencies. Officials who served in an acting capacity are excluded.

\*\* One woman, Jennette Bradley, held both Ohio offices.



**Table 2. Presence of Women of Color as Statewide Executive Candidates and Winners by State Laws Concerning Preprimary Conventions**

	Statewide Party Nominating Convention?		tau- <i>b</i>
	No	Yes	
<b>Democratic Party</b>			
Primary candidate	46.2% (18)	54.6% (6)	.07
Party nominee	37.8% (14)	45.5% (5)	.07
General election winner	10.3% (4)	18.2% (2)	.10
<b>Republican Party</b>			
Primary candidate	18.0% (7)	18.2% (2)	.003
Party nominee	10.8% (4)	18.2% (2)	.09
General election winner	7.7% (3)	9.1% (1)	.02
<i>N</i>	39	11	

Note: Cell entries are percentage of states with at least one serious woman of color primary candidate, party nominee, or general election winner between 2000 and 2012, with state N in parentheses. The measure of party conventions concerns whether parties by law are allowed to nominate candidates by law prior to the primary. The party nominee analysis does not include Louisiana and Washington.

Sources: Center for American Women and Politics; state elections and party websites; Jewell and Morehouse (2001); Bott (1990).

**Table 3. Determinants of the Presence of Women of Color Statewide Executive Candidates**

	Primary Candidate		Party Nominee		General Election Winner	
Preprimary nominating convention	.27 (.55)	.43 (.54)	.55 (.64)	.77 (.67)	.63 (.82)	.73 (.87)
Party competition (gubernatorial vote margin)	-.04 (.03)	-.003 (.03)	-.05 (.03)	-.01 (.04)	0 (.04)	0 (.04)
Democratic party	1.71** (.52)	1.91** (.62)	2.04** (.70)	2.17** (.75)	.50 (.73)	.49 (.71)
State legislator diversity (gender,race)	6.50** (2.24)	--	9.12** (2.62)	--	6.69* (3.08)	--
State racial diversity (population)	--	.08** (.02)	--	.09** (.02)	--	.05* (.03)
Number of statewide offices	.13 (.10)	.09 (.09)	.18 (.10)	.11* (.08)	.22* (.11)	.15 (.10)
Intercept	-3.94** (1.40)	-4.60** (1.58)	-5.55** (1.70)	-5.56** (1.64)	-6.42** (2.20)	-5.23** (1.89)
N	100	100	96	96	100	100
$\chi^2$	18.03**	16.03**	17.37**	19.01**	8.06	5.56

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$

Note: Logistic regression model with robust standard errors clustering on state. The dependent variable is coded 1 if the state-party experienced at least one serious woman of color candidate, party nominee, or winner between 2000 and 2012. States with a statewide preprimary nominating convention by law are coded 1, 0 otherwise; party competition is the gubernatorial vote margin between major party candidates in previous elections; Democratic party is a dichotomous variable; state legislator diversity is the percentage of state legislators who are other than white male (e.g., women and racial minorities); state diversity is a continuous variable for percentage of population that is minority based on the 2000 U.S. Census; statewide offices is the total number of statewide elective executive positions.

Sources: Center for American Women and Politics; NALEO (1999); the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies; UCLA Asian American Studies Center (2000-01); state elections and state party websites; Jewell and Morehouse (2001); Bott (1990); and Humes et al. (2011).

**Table 4. Women of Color Statewide Elective Executive Officeholders (Historical)**

<b>State</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Race</b>	<b>Office</b>
AZ	Sandra Kennedy	open seat	state legislator	2009-	D	Black	Corporation Commiss.
CA	March Fong Eu	open seat	state legislator	1975-1993	D	Asian American	Secretary of State
CA	Kamala Harris	open seat	district attorney	2011-	D	Multiracial	Attorney General
CO	Vikki Buckley	open seat; won party nominating convention	state employee	1995-1999	R	Black	Secretary of State
CT	Denise Nappier	challenger; won party nominating convention	city treasurer	1999-	D	Black	Treasurer
DE	Velda Jones Potter	appointed	business	2009-2011	D	Black	Treasurer
FL	Jennifer Carroll	selected as running mate	state legislator; Navy veteran	2011-2013	R	Black	Lt. Governor
HI	Mazie Hirono	open seat	state legislator	1995-2003	D	Asian American	Lt. Governor
HI	Jean Sadako King	open seat	state legislator	1979-1982	D	Asian American	Lt. Governor
IN	Pamela Carter	open seat; won party nominating convention	deputy chief of staff	1993-1999	D	Black	Attorney General
IN	Karen Freeman-Wilson	appointed	city court judge; deputy prosecutor	2000-2001	D	Black	Attorney General
MT	Denise Juneau	open seat	education official	2009-	D	Native American	Supt. Public Instruction
NM	Dianna Duran	challenger	state legislator	2011-	R	Latina	Secretary of State
NM	Mary Herrera	open seat	county clerk	2007-2011	D	Latina	Secretary of State
NM	Patricia Madrid	open seat	district court judge	1999-2007	D	Latina	Attorney General

**Table 4 (continued)**

<b>State</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Race</b>	<b>Office</b>
NM	Susana Martinez	open seat	county district attorney	2011-	R	Latina	Governor
NM	Clara Padilla Jones	open seat		1983-1986	D	Latina	Secretary of State
NM	Rebecca Vigil-Giron	open seat		1987-1990; 1999-2007	D	Latina	Secretary of State
NV	Catherine Cortez Masto	open seat	asst. county manager; federal criminal prosecutor	2007-	D	Latina	Attorney General
NV	Cheryl Lau	open seat	deputy attorney general	1991-1995	R	Asian American	Secretary of State
OH	Jennette Bradley	selected as running mate	city council	2003-2005	R	Black	Lt. Governor
"	"	appointed	"	2005-2007	"	"	Treasurer
OR	Susan Castillo	open seat; nonpartisan primary	state legislator	2003-2012	NP	Latina	Supt. Public Instruction
SC	Nikki Haley	open seat	state legislator	2011-	R	Asian American	Governor

Note: This table does not include two early twentieth century cases (New Mexico Secretaries of State Soledad Chacon and Margaret Baca). Officials who served in an acting capacity are excluded.

NP is nonpartisan.

Sources: CAWP; state websites; press accounts of elections; Schultz (2000).